



# FOREIGN POLICY BULLETIN

*An interpretation of current international events by the Research Staff of the Foreign Policy Association*

FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION, Incorporated

22 East 38th Street, New York 16, N. Y.

VOL. XXV, No. 26

APRIL 12, 1946

## BRITAIN RESHAPES ALLIANCES TO HOLD POSITION IN MIDDLE EAST

HAVING temporarily disposed of the Iranian case on April 4, the Security Council met again this week to find Russia had notified the United Nations on April 6 that it considered the Council's action on Iran "illegal" and wanted the question removed from the agenda. Meanwhile Dr. Oscar Lange, the Polish delegate, plans to bring the problem of Spain before the Council. Thus Big Three relations continue to focus on the Mediterranean area, where Britain, as active as Russia, has recently been reinforcing its ties with the Arab states, first by granting independent status on March 22 to the former League mandate of Transjordan, and second by preparing for revision of its ten-year treaty of 1936 with Egypt.

As the great powers sought to strengthen their strategic position in the Middle East, President Truman, in his Army Day speech at Chicago on April 6, warned both Russia and Britain that their rivalry in the Arab world "might suddenly erupt into conflict." Secretary of State Byrnes had already demonstrated the concern of the United States about this region by vigorously steering the Council's action on Iran. On April 5 he also urged the Council of Foreign Ministers to meet again in Paris on April 25 to make definite preparation for the conference scheduled in that city on May 1, when the draft peace treaties for Italy, Finland, Bulgaria, Rumania and Hungary are to be considered. To date the deputies of the Foreign Ministers in London have been unable to resolve differences about the important Adriatic port of Trieste and its environs, or the future disposal of Italy's former African Empire and the Dodecanese islands.

**THE IRANIAN SETTLEMENT.** Russia's insistence that the Iranian question be removed from the Security Council's agenda will temper any optimism

over the settlement achieved last week. At best the Council's action on Iran may set a procedural precedent, insuring that the great powers can not prevent initial discussion of grievances brought before the United Nations by small countries. For whatever may be the course of subsequent developments, there is no doubt that the Security Council has already emerged as a forum of world opinion, where both small and large nations may be heard. By answering the request for a report on the negotiations between Teheran and Moscow before the Council's session on April 3, both disputants fulfilled their technical responsibilities under the United Nations Charter. Since the USSR has maintained communication with the United Nations during the course of the discussion of the Russo-Iranian dispute, it is now surprising that its request for removing the issue from the Council's agenda should be based on the alleged illegality of the decision of April 4.

Under the agreements signed between the two countries on April 4, Russian troops are to be withdrawn from Iran by May 6 as requested by the Security Council; the status of Iran's northern province of Azerbaijan is to be dealt with solely by Teheran as a domestic issue; and a proposal for an oil concession for the USSR will be submitted to the next Iranian Parliament to be elected on June 7. No basic substantive issue was decided in this case by the Council, however, and while the curtain was momentarily drawn aside on many confused Middle Eastern problems, Big Three differences over oil and strategy in the Arab world remain unresolved.

**CHALLENGE TO BRITAIN.** Mr. Byrnes took the lead in pressing the Iranian issue before the Security Council, but no country views Russia's emergence as a great power in the Middle East and the Mediterranean with greater anxiety than Britain.

*Contents of this BULLETIN may be reprinted with credit to the Foreign Policy Association.*

Its desire to align the Arab states in firmer friendship may be seen in the recent Franco-British agreement, which the Levant states joined during the middle of March, providing for troop evacuation from Syria and the Lebanon. The Anglo-Transjordan treaty is also evidence of Britain's efforts to "mend its fences" in this area, although independence for Transjordan will doubtless cause both Jews and Arabs to seek speedy withdrawal of British authority in Palestine. But control over the Suez is crucial for Britain's imperial position, and thus the revision of the Anglo-Egyptian treaty assumes greater importance than any other recent British move in the Middle East.

**EGYPT'S KEY POSITION.** The Foreign Office has recognized the major nature of the coming negotiations and has sent a strong delegation to Cairo, which Foreign Secretary Bevin will join at a later stage. Serious anti-British riots during the early part of 1946 revealed the climate of opinion the British will find there and, since the future status of the Sudan is to be raised, it is noteworthy also that Egyptian nationalists have championed Sudan's freedom from British administration and the incorporation of the upper regions of the Nile into Egypt.

## VICTORY OF ROYALIST MINORITY SHARPENS CLEAVAGE IN GREECE

The sharp political cleavage between Right and Left in Greece was irrefutably demonstrated on March 31, in the first national elections held in a decade. The Left boycotted the polls, charging that the voting was a fraud arranged to assure a conservative victory. The pro-royalist Populists won a majority of the ballots cast by the slightly less than fifty per cent of the registered voters who took part in the elections, and a ten-member Rightist coalition cabinet was set up on April 4. The new Premier, Panayotis Poulitas, is President of the State Council—the Greek equivalent of the United States Supreme Court—and has had no previous political experience. He will probably remain in office only until the Populists have chosen one of their own leaders as head of the government.

The royalists, greatly strengthened by the elections, are expected to consolidate their position by two measures. First, Rightist leaders may address a formal request to London asking that British troops be maintained in Greece, thus bolstering Britain's position in this strategically important area of the Mediterranean and crystallizing the division of the Balkans into Russian and British zones of influence. Secondly, they may seek to hold a plebiscite on the return of the king as soon as possible.

**WERE THE ELECTIONS A FRAUD?** Since the elections resulted in widening the schism between the Right and Left, the question whether or not the voting was "rigged" assumes considerable impor-

The Egyptian delegate at the Security Council strongly supported Iran's charges against Russian troops on its soil, and on April 6 Dr. Hafez Afifi Pasha, Egypt's permanent representative on the Council, said in Cairo that while he was fully confident that negotiations of a new Anglo-Egyptian treaty would be successful, if necessary Egypt may submit its case to the United Nations. Under the present treaty Britain may maintain 10,000 land forces and 400 pilots in or near the canal zone. While the present treaty provides for permanency of the historic Anglo-Egyptian military alliance, the question of troops is due for review at this time. Because of rising Egyptian nationalism, other provisions of the 1936 treaty having to do with the maintenance of internal stability in Egypt will also be challenged by the Cairo government on grounds that such terms are limitations of its sovereignty. Since Egypt is the chief leader of the Arab League the new agreement will demonstrate the Labor government's intentions in dealing with the Middle Eastern states, where the twin tasks of guarding strategic interests and fostering freedom and economic development must be undertaken simultaneously.

GRANT S. MCCLELLAN

tance. For the United States this question is a matter of special concern because Americans, as well as British and French representatives, participated in the group of more than 1,200 international observers who were charged with the task of assuring free elections. As preliminary reports indicate, honest elections faced many obstacles, some of which were more or less inevitable because of the violence which has characterized the struggle between Left and Right and between republicans and royalists.

Before World War II Greece was under the dictatorship of General Metaxas, a pro-royalist fearful of Communism, and from 1941 until 1944 the country was occupied by the Nazis and suffered privations exceeding those of other conquered nations. Shortly after liberation Greece became the battleground in a bloody civil war between the Leftist EAM resistance group and the returning government. Since the formal conclusion of hostilities, in January 1945, Rightist terror has prevailed in certain areas controlled by official forces, and the presence of British tanks, guns and armed troops has made it possible for the government to use strong-arm methods in establishing order. The British, consequently, must be regarded as at least partly responsible for the fact that thousands of sympathizers of the EAM were too terrified to come out of their hiding places in the mountains or to sacrifice the protective anonymity of a large city such as Athens, for the purpose of voting, even if EAM

leaders had encouraged them to do so.

On the other hand, responsibility for disorder and terror is by no means attributable to the royalists alone. In Macedonia, where the EAM still retains a stronghold, violence has also occurred. Moreover, the EAM's decision to boycott the elections, however unfavorable the conditions were for a Leftist victory, can hardly be said to have strengthened democratic processes in Greece. Nor can Russia, which has frequently indicated its approval of the EAM, be said to have aided the cause of more representative government in this liberated country by refusing to send observers to join those of the United States, Britain and France. It is hardly possible, moreover, to use the same yardstick in measuring the freedom of elections in Greece that is used in nations, such as our own, which have not been rent by civil war and shattered by economic catastrophe. It seems necessary, instead, to compare the elections with those which have recently taken place in other war-torn countries of southeastern Europe. Viewed from this angle, the Greek elections appear to have been at least as fair, if not more so, than elections recently held under Russian auspices in Bulgaria.

**ROYALISTS A MINORITY.** But even if the elections were as fair as possible under existing circumstances, it does not necessarily follow that they

have solved the problems of finding a government that will be sufficiently representative of the Greek people to insure stability. Since approximately 600,000 of the 950,000 ballots cast were received by the Populists—and it may be assumed that nearly every pro-royalist was among that fifty per cent of the electorate which went to the polls—the royalists constitute at the most only approximately one-third of the registered voters. This means that an attempt on the part of the Populists to restore the king may have to be backed by force.

Under these conditions Britain might find that the group on which it has based its hopes for the safeguarding of British interests is capable of maintaining itself in power only by turning Greece into a police state. It may be assumed that the EAM will oppose this type of régime not only with verbal attacks but with appeals for foreign assistance. Arms might be forthcoming from friendly groups in Albania, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria, while political sympathy might be proffered by Moscow. Such a situation would be embarrassing to Britain in any part of the world where it has important strategic interests, but it would be particularly critical in this outpost in the Mediterranean, where Russia is challenging other traditional British strongholds.

WINIFRED N. HADSEL

## CLASHES IN MANCHURIA RAISE NEW THREAT OF CIVIL WAR

Current clashes between Chinese Government and Communist forces in Manchuria indicate that several key issues affecting American-Soviet relations in the Far East and the future of China may soon reach the crisis stage. These issues may be summarized in three questions: (1) Will China establish a democratic coalition government, in accordance with the agreements reached through General Marshall's mediation in January? (2) What combination of political forces will shape the future of Manchuria, with its forty-odd million people, strategic location, rich resources and valuable industries? (3) Will Washington and Moscow find some means of reducing their differences over China? Although the questions emphasize political problems, they will have to be answered in an atmosphere troubled by food shortages and famine, high prices, low production of consumers' goods, and inadequate transportation.

**RIGHT WING FIGHTS COALITION.** One of the major features of Chinese political life during the past two months has been the attempt of extreme Right wing elements to alter and undermine the all-party agreements of January 31 for a Chinese coalition government. The tactics of the Rightists have ranged from the encouragement of political violence to verbal assaults on more moderate

officials for "corruption" and "inefficiency." This opposition movement expressed itself at the Kuomintang Central Executive Committee's session of March 1-17 in bitter attacks on party leaders who had participated in the unity discussions with the Communists or the negotiations with the Russians.

While pledging Kuomintang support to the unity pacts of January 31, the plenary session proposed fundamental changes in those agreements. The most important alteration relates to China's future constitution. In January the parties agreed on measures to democratize the draft constitution issued by the government in 1936; but the Central Executive Committee voted, in effect, to restore the original document. The agreement of February 25 on the reduction and amalgamation of military forces was also discussed at the plenary session. Under this accord, which was signed by General Marshall and representatives of the government and the Communists, China is to have an army of 90 divisions—a figure which is to be further reduced to 60 divisions after eighteen months. Yet on March 22, less than a week after the close of the Kuomintang meeting, War Minister Chen Cheng declared that China should have a standing army of 150 divisions.

**SHOWDOWN IN MANCHURIA.** These moves took place in an atmosphere of tension over Man-



churia. It is true that Russian troops had begun to withdraw from Mukden in the second week of March, and that on March 22 Moscow declared its forces would be out of Manchuria by the end of April—a pledge which the Chinese Foreign Office later accepted as satisfactory. But the issues raised by Russian occupation of Manchuria beyond the February 1 deadline, as well as by Russian removal of machinery from that region had already had serious repercussions in Chinese political life.

Because the Chinese parties have been unable to agree on the control of Manchuria, a showdown may be imminent. The government points out that, under the January 10 military truce, it has the right to transport troops into or within Manchuria "for the purpose of restoring Chinese sovereignty." It also holds that Communist troop movements in that area have occurred in violation of the agreement. The Communists, on the other hand, argue that the government has broken its promise to cease hostilities—a charge which the government, in turn, levels against the Communists—and that its troop movements in Manchuria are for purposes of civil war, not restoration of sovereignty. Basically the Communists want to extend to Manchuria the coalition agreement reached in January for the rest of China, while the government's position, as expressed by Chiang Kai-shek on April 1, is that it will not consider any demands concerning Manchuria until it has taken over control of the region from the Russians.

BACK TO 1945? Manchuria today is torn by a struggle resembling that which brought China to the brink of all-out civil war last fall, and Washington policy-makers are confronted with problems of intervention similar to those raised under Ambassador Hurley. These policy issues were thought by some to have been settled last December 15, when President Truman suggested that our military and economic assistance to China would be conditional, i.e., would depend on China's progress toward democratic unity. But the meaning of conditional support has been raised sharply by the Chinese Communists, who have asked the United States to stop transporting Central Government troops to Manchuria. Again on April 4 General Chou En-lai, chief Communist representative in the discussions held by General Marshall, declared that foreign aid, especially financial assistance, should not be given to the Chinese government until it has been reorganized as a democratic coalition under the January agreements. Aid under current conditions, he said, would "facilitate a one-party dictatorship" by the

Kuomintang. A Central government spokesman however, declared on April 5 that if the United States gave China a loan, he felt certain the "Communists would join the Government right away."

These issues will not soon be resolved, but they focus attention on American policy. In his Army Day address of April 6 President Truman declared that "the Chinese leaders are on the road to achieving political unity by peaceful and democratic processes." Nevertheless, there is little ground for complacency. Both internal conditions and the state of American Russian relations in that country are charged with dynamite. Under the circumstances continued application of the policy statement of December 15 is necessary if the agreements reached under General Marshall's guidance are to be carried out.

LAWRENCE K. ROSINGER

### RESIGNATION OF GENERAL MCCOY

The Board of Directors of the Foreign Policy Association announces with regret that Major General Frank R. McCoy resigned as President on April 1, 1946, owing to the pressure of his duties as Chairman and American member of the Far Eastern Commission. General McCoy has been elected President Emeritus of the Association and will continue his membership on the Board of Directors.

Since General McCoy assumed the Presidency of the Association in September 1939, the membership has more than doubled and the number of branches has increased from seventeen to thirty-two.

General McCoy's distinguished career has included combat service in the Spanish-American War, the Philippine Insurrection and World War I. He was military aide to President Theodore Roosevelt; Chief-of-Staff to the American Mission to Armenia in 1919; Director-General of the Red Cross and Commander of the American Relief Commission to Japan in 1923; Chief of the American Electoral Mission to Nicaragua in 1927-28; Chairman of the Bolivia-Paraguay Conciliation Commission in 1929; and American member of the Lytton Commission to Manchuria in 1932. He is a Doctor of Laws (Princeton, Yale, Columbia) and holds the Distinguished Service Medal.

Pending the election of a successor to General McCoy, the Board of Directors has appointed itself as chief executive in the interim and has designated its chairman, Mr. William W. Lancaster to act as its spokesman for this purpose. Mr. Herbert L. May, a member of the Board, has consented at its request to act as liaison between the staff and Mr. Lancaster with the title of Director-in-Charge.

*The Case Against the Nazi War Criminals*, by Robert H. Jackson. New York, Knopf, 1946. \$2.00

Justice Jackson's book containing the basic documents of the Nuremberg trials and an exposition of international law and justice is the most readable and illuminating non-technical treatment of the subject that has appeared.

FOREIGN POLICY BULLETIN. Vol. XXV, No. 26, APRIL 12, 1946. Published weekly by the Foreign Policy Association, Incorporated. National Headquarters, 22 East 38th Street, New York 16, N. Y. FRANK ROSS MCCOY, *President Emeritus*; DOROTHY F. LEBET, *Secretary*; VERA MICHELES DEAN, *Editor*. Entered as second-class matter December 2, 1921, at the Post Office, at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Three Dollars a Year. Please allow at least one month for change of address on membership publications.

F. P. A. Membership (which includes the Bulletin), Five Dollars a Year  
Produced under union conditions and composed and printed by union labor.